University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

8-2008

Ideological influence on higher education : progressivism versus conservatism.

Anthony W. Robinson 1972-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Robinson, Anthony W. 1972-, "Ideological influence on higher education : progressivism versus conservatism." (2008). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1220.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1220>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION:
PROGRESSIVISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

By

Anthony W. Robinson

B.A, University of Louisville, 1999

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Leadership, Foundations
and Human Resources Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

August, 2008

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION:
PROGRESSIVISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

By

Anthony W. Robinson

B.A., University of Louisville, 1999

A thesis approved on

June 16, 2008

by the following Thesis Committee

Thesis Director

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my wife,
Jennifer Robinson
for her patience and constant support
through this entire process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my thesis director, Dr. John Keedy, for his support, patience and guidance. I would also like to acknowledge the other committee members, Dr. Tracy K'Meyer and Dr. Bert Lyons, for their time and help in this endeavor. I would also like to acknowledge my wife for her wonderful support. She stood by me when it looked like I would never finish and provided strength when I wanted to quit. I would like to acknowledge my mother, Nancy Robinson, for letting me bounce ideas off of her, as well as Patrick Spradling for urging me on and giving me an outlet when I was at wits' end. I also would like to acknowledge Luke Buckman for helping me hone my arguments and editing early drafts of this thesis.

ABSTRACT

IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION: PROGRESSIVISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

Anthony Ward Robinson

June 16, 2008

This thesis is a historical analysis of the role the federal government has had in the in development student aid funding in the modern public four-year higher education system. It begins with a historical overview of the rise of progressivism as a significant animator of the federal government in the twentieth century. It focuses on the creation of the Pell Grant and Stafford Loan student aid vehicles and the effect that had on the creation of the modern middle-class. It then provides a discussion of the political and cultural backlash that was created by the ascendancy of conservatism in the United States and its effects on student aid funding.

The thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter One provides the thesis of the paper as well as an overview of the structure of the proceeding chapters. Chapter Two provides an overview twentieth century progressivism and

the steps taken by the federal government undertook to help create the modern middle-class. Chapter Three provides an overview of the conservative ascendancy that began in the post World War II era that wanted to roll back the federal policies of the progressives. Budgetary data from the years 1986, 1996 and 2005 to illustrate how conservative ideology has made access to federal student aid more difficult. Chapter Four provides a discussion of the findings, suggestions to policymakers as well as suggestions for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Overview.....	1
Chapter Structure.....	3
II. PROGRESSIVE ASCENDENCY AND THE CREATION OF THE MODERN MIDDLE CLASS.....	5
Federal Role in Higher Education in the Late 1800s.....	7
Ascendency of Progressivism.....	10
Federal Role in Higher Education World War II to the 1950's.....	13

Ascendency of the Middle Class.....	16
Johnson's Great Society.....	20
Higher Education Act of 1965.....	23
Rise of the Knowledge worker.....	28
The Demise of Progressivism.....	33
III. CONSERVATISM: FROM INSURGENCY TO ASCENDENCY...	36
Conservatism in the Post World War II	
America.....	37
Conservative Anti-Communism.....	40
Societal Critique.....	43
Higher Education: A Private Good?.....	46
Budget Data During the Conservative	
Ascendency: 1986, 1996, 2005.....	48
IV. SUMMARY.....	62
Implications of the Research.....	62
Suggestions to Policy Makers.....	69
Suggestions for Further Research.....	72
REFERENCES.....	74

APPENDIX.....	82
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGE
1. Amounts Allocated to Higher education, student aid breakdown (in millions) & number of aid recipients (in thousands), 1965, 1966, 1967.....	26
2. Aid available in 1986 with classification of aid type and average loan amount, 1986.....	51
3. Pell grant, subsidized Stafford and PLUS loan funding including average award/loan amounts for 1996.....	53
4. Unsubsidized Stafford totals and loan amounts for 1996.....	54
5. Aid Funds Available for Higher Education, 2005.....	58
6. Number of students aided and average aid award/loan, 2005.....	58

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	PAGE
1. Manufacturing employment data 1965-2005.....	19
2. Information employment data 1965-2006.....	30
3. Financial activities employment data 1965-2005.....	30
4. Professional and Business services employment data 1965-2006.....	31
5. Education & Health Sector employment data 1965-2005...	32

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This purpose of this thesis is to investigate how the federal government's role in higher education funding has affected the development of higher education in the United States. The author asserts that this role has been fundamentally Progressive and that this Progressive impulse has opened educational opportunity to a larger portion of the American public. The broadening of access to higher education provided the means for more people to attain access to higher wage jobs, which provided them with a way into higher socioeconomic levels.

This expanded access to higher education originates through various avenues, from helping in the creation of the land-grant institutions to providing direct student aid. The author contends that the ideological opposition to the federal role in higher education, by modern conservatism, is fundamentally altering access to higher education. This is illustrated by the way in which

President George W. Bush has approached the funding of student aid programs. While federal funding has maintained a relatively steady pace with regard to the amounts allocated to higher education, this funding has not kept pace with the inflationary rates associated with higher education (College Board, 2007). The increased difficulty of affording a postsecondary education is having a negative effect on student access to higher education, which then makes it more difficult for students to compete in the economic marketplace.

The purpose of the study is to examine the historical record will illustrate that progressive tendencies have had a guiding influence in the relationship among the federal government, higher education and society more broadly. This study will be strengthened by the inclusion of the budgetary data of 1966. The author also argues that modern conservative ideologies now are inherently hostile to the development of higher education in the U.S. both ideologically and in the relationship higher education had with the government. Paying particular attention to the monies allocated for student aid, this conservative hostility will be investigated by analyzing the federal spending patterns for higher education for the years 1986, 1996 and 2005.

Chapter Structure

This thesis is divided into four chapters. Each chapter focuses on a particular matter that provides support to the thesis as a whole. Chapter one has provided the thesis and the hypotheses that are being investigated. A concise overview of what the individual chapters will comprise is also included.

Chapter Two provides a brief history of the role of the federal government in the 1800s and moves on to an overview of the rise of progressivism as a force for change in the U.S. beginning with the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt and culminating in Lyndon Johnson's administration. The chapter also illustrates how progressive ideological governance provided avenues for more people to join the ranks of the middle-class, primarily by providing substantial support for higher education. The federal budgets of 1966 and 1967 illustrate how the progressive impulse moved ideas to action through increased funding for education.

The rise of the modern conservative movement at the end of World War II and its development in reaction to the progressive ideals shaping both federal policy and society

at large are the focus of Chapter Three. The federal budgets of 1986, 1996 and 2005 illustrate these governing philosophies practice, especially their effect on the cost of and access to higher education for those in the middle and working classes. A discussion of how the job markets in the United States have changed since the 1970s demonstrates the salience of access to affordable higher education. This discussion shows how limiting access to a college degree can have a negative impact on the ability of the U.S. to compete for jobs.

The fourth and final chapter summarizes the work and offers the author's comments on the findings. Implications are discussed as well as potential questions for further research.

CHAPTER II: PROGRESSIVE ASCENDENCY AND THE CREATION OF THE MODERN MIDDLE CLASS

This chapter contains eight sections. Section one discusses how the federal government involved itself in higher education during the post-Civil War years. Section two introduces progressivism as federal government policy and how progressive ideology animated the New Deal programs of the Roosevelt administration. The third section offers a view of the progressive position the government took with regards to higher education funding in the immediate aftermath of World War II. Section four discusses how the New Deal programs helped in the creation of a manufacturing middle-class in the mid-twentieth century, as well as the obstacles that began to slow the growth of this sector of the middle-class.

The fifth section is a historical summary of the Great Society initiatives of the Johnson administration and how they built on the foundations of the New Deal to expand opportunity to more people. The sixth section focuses on the Higher Education Act of 1965 with attention paid to the

development of the Act the allocation of federal funds to it and effect on the growth higher education. Section seven focuses on how the job markets have shifted away from manufacturing and towards more highly professionalized jobs, leading to an increased reliance on federal funding for attainment of a higher education. The last section discusses the slow transition from progressive to conservative tendencies in the United States over the last thirty years.

The term "progressive" is used throughout most of this thesis as opposed to the term "liberal", because the topic is higher education. Educational policy from Presidents Roosevelt to Johnson was based on reformers such as John Dewey's philosophy of progressivism, which saw education as a means to further social reform and build equality (Jeynes, 2007). To help in the building of a more equitable society successive presidential administrations in the twentieth century utilized the power of the federal government's purse to propel these progressive educational ideals into action.

Federal Role in Higher Education in the Late 1800s

The foundations of the progressive ideal of higher education started to take shape in the era of the Civil War. Congressman Justin Morrill suggested the creation of the federally funded land grant colleges and universities (Rudolph, 1990). Morrill's bill was created in response to the need for colleges and universities to provide more practically oriented educational opportunities than were available in the more classically and theologically based institutions. The necessity for the development of practical disciplines was becoming more evident as the industrial revolution took hold in the United States. Expanding industrial bases and changing technologies fueled the necessity of more engineers.

In the post Civil War period the number of U.S. colleges and universities grew as the Morrill Land Grant Act provided the states large tracts of land on which to build universities (Unger, 1996). Although these institutions still taught the classical liberal arts curriculum there was a shift toward the practical application of education. The country saw a growth in schools of engineering to fulfill the mechanical needs of an expanding industrial economy. There was also significant

growth in agricultural studies to provide the sustenance needed for a rapidly growing population (Rudolph, 1990). These new areas of emphasis had a "democratizing" effect on higher education (Key, 1996).

Not all segments of the population reacted positively to the expansion of higher education; this was in part due to anti-intellectualism and in part from a fear of change in the status quo (Hofstadter, 1963). Many farmers balked at the idea of needing a college degree to manage a farm, thinking that the study of agriculture was superfluous to actual farming (Rudolph, 1990). For many, farming was a vocation passed on from generation to generation and not something to be studied in the classroom.

Furthermore, there was a fear that the lure of the classroom would persuade many farmers' sons away from farming altogether as they were exposed to the wider world, leaving those on the farm shorthanded (Rudolph, 1990). More people attended college than in previous generations but the proportion of the population obtaining a college education was still far below what it would become in the twentieth century.

In 1890, the land grant acts got another monetary boost by the federal government. The Morrill Act of 1890 established annual appropriations to the land grant

colleges for the improvement and expansion of the agricultural and mechanical arts. However, a stipulation was written into the bill prohibiting states from receiving funds if they discriminated on the basis of race. States worked around this by creating "separate but equal" land grant colleges for African-Americans (Rudolph, 1990). The federal government was utilizing the power of the purse to foster equal educational access for all citizens.

The Morrill Acts created a role for the federal government in higher education, which until then had been the sole province of the private and state sectors. The Morrill Acts may not mark the true beginning of the progressive movement in federal policymaking with regards to higher education but it laid the groundwork for the future. There was an understanding from the perspective of the government, that education, particularly higher education, was important for the country. Although very few initially took advantage of this new opportunity the benefits were tangible to the few who did. The knowledge gained helped those who attended earn a higher wage due, in part, to the knowledge gained through a higher education. The nation as a whole was made stronger as the number of educated people increased spurring innovation in industry and agriculture.

Ascendancy of Progressivism

When Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) took office in 1933 the country was reeling from a depression. There were hundreds of thousands of people homeless and fully one quarter of the U.S. population was unemployed (Dunlop & Galenson, 1978). FDR believed that the federal government had a significant role in regulating the economy to promote social justice and freedom (Department of Labor [DL], 2008).

Upon taking the presidency, FDR and his administration implemented his campaign promises of instituting what has been referred to as the first New Deal for the people of the United States (Dunlop & Galenson, 1978). The New Deal heralded a significant increase of the federal government's role in the everyday lives of its citizens. These federal policies were designed to alleviate the suffering of the Depression. Massive public works projects such as the Tennessee Valley Authority helped to diminish the unemployment rate and to provide electricity to rural areas. The Works Progress Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps and the Civil Works Administration provided work to an unemployed nation (Department of Labor, 2008). Laws such as the Agriculture Adjustment Act helped

protect commercial farmers through government subsidies (DL, 2008). These policies were created with the aim of ensuring that the basic needs of the citizens could be met.

The early New Deal years also saw the first foray of the government into direct student funding for education. The National Youth Administration (NYA), initiated in 1935, was created to provide employment to people between 16 and 25 years old who were no longer attending school regularly (Congressional Digest, 1963). One part of the program provided students the opportunity to work on projects with pay in their schools, to help keep them in attendance. A second part was created to help students who had already dropped out of school obtain employment and job (Congressional Digest, 1963).

With the country beginning to recover from the Depression, FDR implemented the second round of reforms that encompass the New Deal. These new programs were designed to reallocate the relative power of workers and industry through the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The FLSA helped abolish child labor, created a 40-hour workweek, and mandated a "living wage". The lynchpin of the second round of New Deal policies was the Social Security Act of 1935, which provided aid and social services to the poverty-stricken as well as a small pension program for

many workers (DL, 2008). Federally funded unemployment programs created a safety net that ensured that the working poor were able to meet day-to-day needs in the event they lost their jobs (DL, 2008).

Another progressive program created by FDR was the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Created in 1934, the purpose of the FHA was to assist the housing market, deflated during the Great Depression. The FHA did this by insuring mortgage loans for people who were unable to obtain them independently. Prior to the FHA, mortgage companies provided loan terms that would cover up to 50% of a home's cost and were in addition, short term loans, typically three to five years (Monroe, 2001). The FHA put the "full faith and credit" of the federal government behind housing loans, underwriting up to 90% of a home's value. After World War II ended, the Veteran's Administration (VA) also provided housing loans as part of the G.I. Bill (Jackson, 1985). This benefit, combined with the FHA, gave millions of people the opportunity to purchase a home (Chafe, 1985). These policies provided opportunities for workers in the manufacturing sectors to gain access to the privileges of the middle class.

Federal Role in Higher Education:

World War II to the 1950s

After World War II the federal government changed higher education dramatically with the signing into law of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 ("G.I. Bill"), giving a far greater number of students the ability to attend college than ever before. Men and women of varied socioeconomic background and race suddenly had the opportunity to go back to school, which was particularly important to the African-American community. These new educational opportunities were considered the "foundational cornerstone" of the civil rights movement due to two events (Jeynes, 2007). The first was the atrocities committed by the Nazis and Imperial Japanese. The gruesome extent of these barbarisms focused the collective American mind on the horror that unchecked racism and forced conformity can create. The second was the rise of the U.S. to superpower status. The combination of these two events helped to shape the American idea that education was important. The United States utilized education as a way to promote equality and ease racism at home which, in turn, helped blunt Soviet

criticism that the U.S. was a poor world leader due their racial problems at home (Jenyess, 2007 p. 249).

The numbers of students attending colleges and trade schools greatly expanded as people took advantage of this new opportunity. As the American economy became more industrial and automated, workers needed more highly specific skill sets to enable societal upward socioeconomic mobility. While industrial manufacturing jobs were abundant and well paid many people wanted to gain access to the new more specialized job sectors of management, science and technology that were being spurred on, in part, by the manufacturing sector. The men and women who utilized the G.I. Bill believed that attaining a college degree would grant them a better life in the age of occupational specialization (Unger, 1996).

Early government programs funding education were not restricted to providing tuition for veterans; Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) to aid in the recruitment and training of math, science and foreign languages at the university level and while this act was not necessarily taken up for progressive reasons it did serve to expand funding opportunities to a larger population. The NDEA was passed in response to the launching of the Sputnik satellite by the Soviet Union in

1957, to alleviate the perceived education gap America believed it had with the Soviets (Brown, 1988). Education was fast becoming a top priority for the federal government as the development of the country's technical skill was felt to be vital to the defense of the nation against possible Soviet aggression. The new money lavished upon the universities in the form of aid enabled them to build and maintain new facilities, particularly in the areas of the natural sciences and engineering (Kizer, 1970). These new facilities and programs had the effect of dramatically increasing enrollment in the nation's universities.

The availability of federal money through the G.I. Bill, and to some extent the NDEA in later years, helped establish a new avenue to higher education unavailable to many before. According to estimates by Fredrick Rudolph about 3.6 million veterans took advantage of the G.I. Bill (1990). These numbers helped to alter the face of higher education but also increased the number of people who had a baccalaureate or beyond. The federal G.I. Bill would help establish a second avenue people could utilize to gain access to the middle-class.

Ascendency of the Middle-Class

In the United States the size of the middle class increased significantly during the post-World War II economic boom of the mid-twentieth century. The middle class became the backbone of the nation's stability, providing leadership to the government and society (Huber, Rueschemeyer & Stephens, 1993). The middle class was often defined in the mid-1950s as consisting of families with an income between \$3,000 and \$10,000 (Chafe, 1996). A large number of Americans reached this income level through well-paying manufacturing jobs.

This boom was created by several different factors. The FHA and VA housing benefits providing more favorable mortgage terms sparked a marked increase in home buying and building. The number of houses built and bought between 1940 and 1941 increased by over 90,000 (Jackson, 1985). This helped establish a larger land-owning class, bolstering the economy in the post war years as housing-related purchasing increased (Chafe, 1995).

As the World War II soldiers returned home, there was an explosion in consumerism, occurring in part due to the pent-up demand that had been suppressed during the conservation economy of the war years (Chafe, 1995). This

new consumerism was driven by the strength of the manufacturing facilities in the United States. Europe and many portions of Asia were utterly devastated during the war and had no manufacturing capability, but the U.S. had suffered no destruction of its manufacturing infrastructure. The manufacturing base had been established due to the effort exerted on the home front to provide war

materiel for the troops, making the shift to post-war manufacturing much easier (Chafe, 1995).

Industrial manufacturing jobs paid well, due in large part, to a rise in strength and influence of labor unions, facilitated by the National Labor Relations Act. Utilizing the provisions of the NLRA, unions were able to organize skilled manufacturing workers more effectively. Groups of manufacturing employees such as the autoworkers were able to negotiate and agitate for higher wages and fringe benefits creating good paying blue-collar jobs in these plants (Coleman, 1988). Many of these jobs did not typically require more than a grade school or high school education, which facilitated the upward mobility of thousands of families in the U.S. and creating a burgeoning middle class (Chafe, 1995). By 1956 the United States had begun to shift away from a manufacturing-based economy and toward a post-industrial

economy based on white-collar workers (Chafe, 1995). The downward drift of manufacturing jobs was due to several factors. Advances in automation allowed companies to increase the pace of the growth in business but slowed job creation, as machines replaced people. Outsourcing was another factor as companies sought less expensive means of production, often by moving manufacturing out of the country altogether (Cowie, 1999).

By the mid-1970s the economy took a downturn and manufacturers found increasing competition from the now recovered economies of Europe and Asia. This competition led to job layoffs and U.S. corporations began scrambling to find ways to survive in an increasingly competitive global market. One way in which corporations dealt with this was simply to move jobs to locations where labor was inexpensive. This was not a new phenomenon in U.S. economic history; an example is RCA, which consistently moved their plants further and further south throughout the twentieth century until they were finally in Mexico (Cowie, 1999). Currently outsourcing of manufacturing jobs from the United States is accelerating. As illustrated in Figure One, the high water mark of manufacturing jobs in the U.S. was in 1979, when there were over 19 million of these jobs

available in the U.S. By 2005 there were fewer than 15 million (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008).

Figure 1

Manufacturing employment data 1965-2005 (data from Bureau of Labor Statistics website)

Global competition meant that U.S. companies had to make their products as cheaply as they could to maximize profit. Companies could usually find tax relief and a cheap abundant labor force, often with lax labor laws in countries that were desperate for any jobs at all. This

movement of jobs left many Americans unable to join or maintain their standing in the middle class (Cowie, 1999).

The adjustment of the economy from an industrial to a post-industrial model did not occur overnight. Beginning in 1956, manufacturing job creation began to level off and white-collar jobs began to increase. Where once blue-collar workers were able to join the middle class they now found themselves falling behind, as outsourcing and automation began to take its toll. Even as these jobs were being lost, better paying jobs were being created as the white-collar sector grew. Many of the workers in manufacturing, however, were unable to compete for these jobs, as the educational requirements were much higher (Baum & Ma, 2007).

Johnson's Great Society

The middle class and the U.S. economy generally continued to grow during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Both administrations continued the progressive policy of utilizing the power of federal government for the good of the individual. President Eisenhower maintained the New Deal policies of FDR and President Truman, and as previously discussed, expanded aid to higher education with the National Defense Education Act

of 1958 (NDEA). Kennedy's New Frontier went further than Eisenhower in his policies and was seen as responding to the needs that remained unaddressed by the New Deal initiatives (Unger, 1996). The New Frontier programs did not accomplish as much as intended due to conservatives in Congress slowing its progress (Graham, 1984; Unger, 1996).

Johnson wanted to increase education funding much further and much faster than did President Kennedy. Johnson's Great Society differed from the New Deal and the New Frontier programs in two fundamental ways. First, while the New Deal attempted to mitigate the consequences of poverty, the Great Society's intent was to eradicate the root causes of poverty itself (Hess & McGuinn, 2005). Second, Johnson and the Democrats had full control over both houses of Congress after the elections of 1964 and so faced less opposition to his proposals (Unger 1994).

Johnson had aspired to utilize the power of the federal government not only to end poverty but also racial injustice (Cloward & Piven, 2005). The administration recognized that the civil rights movement highlighted the economic and educational disparities within racial groups. Highlighting the economic deprivation of minority groups would encourage acceptance of the idea that the government should have a more active role in the schools (Hess &

McGuinn, 2005), to create upward social mobility for minorities.

The federal activism of the administration extended into all realms of the educational system but higher education perhaps gained most from Johnson's desire to overhaul the economic order of the United States (Graham, 1984). President Johnson utilized his position to help usher through many anti-poverty initiatives, from jobs creation packages and tax incentives to the creation of Medicare.

Johnson himself had been a teacher and understood the power of education as an anti-poverty measure; educational reform therefore became one of the cornerstones of his presidency (Graham, 1984). The Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) became the largest expansion of federal aid to higher education in history. The hallmark of the bill was Title IV, which created a grant and loan system for students who had not qualified for the other federal funding streams already available, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and the Serviceman's Readjustment Act (G.I. Bill) (Rudy, 2003).

President Johnson, whose administration represented the historical pinnacle of progressive governance, believed that the government had a moral obligation to ensure that

everyone had equal opportunity to obtain a college degree. This access to education, in turn, would help the society as a whole. The progressive view was that while the individual certainly benefited from obtaining higher education, society as a whole reaped benefits as well: the individual with a higher education had an increased earning potential (Porter, 2002), which also created more tax revenue for the government. Furthermore, individuals with a college education would be more likely to engage in the civic life of their communities, increasing the responsible citizenship of the nation as a whole (O'Connor, 2006).

The progressive view of education as a public good worthy of federal attention and largesse became a hallmark of Johnson's administration. The money granted to universities created unprecedented access to higher education. As the next section illustrates, this progressive view regarding the benefits of education to the individual and the society as a whole was underscored by the budgetary support provided to education.

Higher Education Act of 1965

Despite the post World War II government funding for higher education, the number of college students from the

upper and upper middle-classes was larger than that of other socioeconomic groups. In the increasingly specialized world of work, however, those not attending some form of post-secondary education were finding themselves in difficult job markets. It was obvious that those who managed to attain a baccalaureate degree gave themselves and their families a chance at a better life (David, 1963). Access to higher education would become even easier under the administration of President Lyndon Johnson.

The opportunity of higher education was offered to a larger number of Americans than ever before with the passing in 1965 of the Higher Education Act (HEA). The HEA was the largest federally funded student aid program ever undertaken; the law was a cornerstone of President Johnson's Great Society initiatives (Graham, 1984). Johnson believed that that "education was a key element in combating poverty" (Graham, 1984, pp 54).

The HEA expanded federal funding in many domains of higher education, including increased monetary support given to urban universities and aid to black colleges, upgrading research capabilities and library capacities, and Title IV providing direct student funding. Title IV offered students several avenues to obtain aid for covering tuition. The bill put the credit of the U.S. government at

the disposal of every student, regardless of need, by subsidizing interest rates (The Higher Education Act of 1965: Questions and Answers, 1965). Commercial banks provided loans to students for tuition and expenses. The federal government offset the interest rate, setting it at 3% to be paid off in the 10 years after the student left college (Graham, 1984). Full financial grants became available to students whose economic need was the greatest.

Increased amounts of federal funding had the expected effect of increasing the number of students attending college. In 1963 there were more than 2.3 million students enrolled in public four year institutions; by 1966 the number climbed to over 3.1 million (Digest of Educational Statistics [DES], 2005). By 1968, three years after the HEA passed, student enrollments reached 3.7 million, an over one million-student increase in three years (DES, 2005).

The educational progressivism of Lyndon Johnson and the Democrats was manifest in the budgets passed after the HEA was signed into law. The year 1966 was the first year that the HEA was fully funded and, as such, there was a significant increase in the amount of federal outlay provided to higher education. In 1965 the amount given to higher education was \$396 million (Office of Budget Management [OBM], 2008). Once the HEA was implemented in

1966, the amount climbed to \$648 million with \$240 million being allocated to direct aid to undergraduate and graduate students (OBM 2008 & 1968). Higher education funding jumped to \$972 million for 1967 with student aid making up \$471 million of this (OBM, 2008 & 1968). Table One shows the breakdown for the monies appropriated to higher education and the monies were allocated to the various grant and loan programs during these years. Also included in the table are the numbers of students that were served by each of the programs.

Table 1

Amounts Allocated to Higher education, student aid breakdown (in millions) & number of aid recipients (in thousands), 1965, 1966, 1967

	1965	1966	1967
Funds to Higher Education	396	648	972
Educational opportunity grants (eog) and insured loans	---	59.9	233.6
EOG	---	59.9	112.7
Students served	---	134,468	221,000
Insured Loans	---	---	40.5
Students Served	---	---	480,000

(Data from Office of Budget Management, 1968 & 2006)

The amount appropriated to aid alone in 1967 was more than half the amount given to higher education overall in 1965. The creation of student aid outside of NDEA and G.I. Bill monies helped offset the costs of tuition for a much

greater swath of the population. When one considers that full-time study with room and board for the public four-year institutions averaged \$983 in 1966 this new aid helped (Digest of Educational Statistics [DES], 2004). Adjusted for inflation, this cost is the equivalent to \$6,384 [2006 dollars], according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator (<http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl>).

The HEA was designed differently from the NDEA and the G.I. Bill. The NDEA required students to study natural sciences, engineering or critical languages areas in which it was believed that the United States was falling behind the Soviet Union. The G.I. Bill allowed students to study any subject at all; however, they had to be veterans to gain access to that funding. The HEA allowed all students to study what they wanted with no strings attached. Funding decisions were based on financial need rather than other qualifying criteria.

The increased access to a college degree created by Johnson and his Democratic allies can be demonstrated by scanning enrollment numbers. In 1956 there were more than 2.3 million people enrolled in higher education either through use of the G.I. Bill benefit or having the money to afford college independently

(www.census.gov/population/sodemo/school/tableA-6.xls). In 1965 2.9 million people were enrolled at four-year public institutions including those using the G.I. Bill and the NDEA to pay for school. Enrollment in these institutions climbed to 3.16 million students in 1966 when the HEA was first funded. The enrollment numbers rose in 1967 to 3.4 million students.

Higher education allowed more people to move into the knowledge worker class, which was expanding as the manufacturing sector in the United States began to contract. The new college graduates created via the HEA also realized a higher standard of living than those who had preceded them into the middle class, as the knowledge-based jobs were better paid than the by jobs in manufacturing had been (Baum & Ma, 2007).

Rise of the Knowledge Worker

As manufacturing job growth continued to contract throughout the 1970s and 1980s via outsourcing, automation and competition, a burgeoning class of white-collar jobs was filling the jobs void. There was a larger number of jobs for managers, technicians, engineers, teachers and health care workers. This new class of workers was

fundamentally altering the workforce landscape as they did not physically create material but created and manipulated knowledge, making "theoretical knowledge a centerpiece of economic development" (Chafe, 1995, p.114).

One of these knowledge-based growth areas is information technology (IT), which requires some level of post-secondary education. As Figure Two indicates, the job growth in this sector has been rapidly increasing for more than 15 years. The financial sector (including insurance and real estate) saw steady growth during the late 1960s with much more rapid growth over the last 20 years. Figure Three shows the progressive rise in these job sectors with a concomitant demand for post-secondary education.

Figure 2

Information Sector 1965-2006 (data from Bureau of Labor Statistics website)

Figure 3

Financial activities employment data 1965-2005 (data from Bureau of Labor Statistics website)

The professional employment sector includes management, scientific and administrative services. As illustrated in Figure Four the professional sector increased over 10 million jobs since 1969. The areas of education, health and social assistance, (including teaching, nursing, medicine, and social work) have been expanding dramatically. As indicated by Figure Five these fields have seen the creation of 11 million new jobs between 1979 and 2006 (DL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008).

Figure 4

Professional and business services employment data 1965-2006 (data from Bureau of Labor Statistics website)

Figure 5

Education, Health & Social Assistance Sector employment data 1965-2005
(data from Bureau of Labor Statistics website)

These service and knowledge sectors are fast becoming the new backbone of the U.S. economy (DL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). Workers are no longer able to rely on simply being able to manipulate the means of production, rather as Peter Drucker wrote, "knowledge workers own the means of production. It is the knowledge between their ears" (Drucker, 1999, p. 149). This increasing reliance on education has the potential to leave those on the lower socioeconomic levels trapped there unless access to education remains affordable.

Obtaining a higher education, however, is becoming more difficult for the middle and lower socioeconomic classes, due in to increasing costs (Kalenburg, 2006). This puts many families in a difficult position since parents

want their children's fortunes to be better than their own. These families are increasingly relying on alternative funding avenues to pay for college.

In sum, progressive federal policies on higher education funding throughout the twentieth century led many parents and students to assume that financial aid would allow them to go to college since the federal government has involved itself with higher education in some form or another for over 150 years. From the time of the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862 to the Higher Education Act of 1965 the government funded the establishment and maintenance of the public university system. Overtime, the government increased its role in offsetting the funding gap that is growing from year to year for many families.

The Decline of Progressivism

The policies and programs of the federal government have been progressive in orientation since the 1930s, based on the idea that the government should use its power to create better living circumstances for all citizens. The progressivism that these programs relied on did not reside solely in the halls of government but acted as the guiding influence for a majority of society as well. The American

people stood behind the decisions to create the progressive New Deal policies that pulled the United States out of the Great Depression as evidenced by FDR's several reelections.

Progressivism, or liberalism in the terminology of the time, had become the dominant form of intellectual discourse in the United States, so much so that literary critic and intellectual, Lionel Trilling went so far as to say, "liberalism is not only the dominant but the sole intellectual tradition in the United States" (Trilling, 1950, p. ix). The liberal impulse (i.e., progressive) came to dominate cultural and political life to the point that Republicans themselves found that they were unable to deny its influence. Republican president Eisenhower not only strengthened New Deal programs but also expanded them (Cotter, 1983).

Although the tenets of progressivism appeared to be the conventional wisdom, not everyone in the United States accepted the progressive point of view (Galbraith, 1984). There was a disaffected group of conservatives within the U.S. that believed that the course of the country was being subverted from the original intent of the Founding Fathers. They viewed with dismay the ways in which, it appeared, the federal government had come to influence the individual (Nash, 1996).

Disparate in background and lacking any traction in the public discourse at large, these conservative groups relentlessly attacked the progressivism that had helped in the creation of modern America. Eventually these groups would draw more attention and support from the public. Ultimately they would find themselves no longer the insurgents "standing athwart history screaming stop" as William Buckley described the conservative cause, but rather would assume control of the government.

As the conservatives have become more powerful they have found ways to disengage the federal government from its earlier roles. Programs from welfare reform to spending on higher education have changed in recent decades. To understand how this shift occurred and the effects it has had on the society at large one must trace the modern conservative movement from outsider insurgency to political power broker.

CHAPTER III: CONSERVATISM: FROM INSURGENCY TO ASCENDENCY

This chapter contains five sections outlining the rise of conservatism from a nascent modern American phenomenon to one that has come to dominate the public sphere. The first section provides definitions of what a conservative is from various perspectives, and then briefly outlines the rise of the modern conservative movement from the New Deal to the post World War II era. The nexus of post World War II conservatism, anti-communism, is the focus of the second section.

The societal issues conservatives felt plagued America and how they defined those problems as a consequence of progressivism is discussed in section three. Section four focuses on how conservatives viewed education and education policy. The fifth section investigates budget data from the years 1986, 1996 and 2005 to illustrate how the conservative ideologies have come to the fore in policymaking. This section also studies how students are handling the changes in funding availability.

Conservatism in Post World War II America

Political observers and scholars have defined conservatism in the United States in numerous ways. In his work, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in the America since 1945*, George Nash defined it as encompassing libertarianism, traditionalism and militant evangelical anti-communism (Nash, 1996, p. xiv). Richard Hofstadter argued that conservatism emerged where the old American social structure was threatened by the modernizing forces that were taking hold in the post World War II era (Hofstadter, 1965).

These definitions have one common thread, the desire to maintain the *status quo* and slow or reverse change. This desire to keep modernity at bay is one of the defining features of the conservative movement in America (Hofstadter, 1963). The full historical scope of conservatism is far beyond the reach of this thesis. Rather, the author will focus on a brief survey of the development of conservatism during the 1950s and 1960s, because out of this period grew the arguments that became the cornerstone upon which twenty-first century conservatism is built.

In the post World War II political landscape conservatism was in disarray. The popularity of Franklin Roosevelt (FDR) and the New Deal programs made the future of conservatism appear bleak. There were, however, conservatives in society and although they disagreed on many ideological issues they managed to find enough in common to work in tandem against the New Deal progressives.

This new conservatism had two main branches, which hold true to this day, libertarianism and traditionalism. The *libertarians* held that America worked best when the federal government remained out of the individual's life. They believed in *laissez faire* economic policy, which relies on leaving the business markets unhindered by government regulation and in dismantling the New Deal programs instituted under FDR. Libertarians resisted the expanding power of the State as an infringement on individual liberty (Nash, 1996). They understood the market to be best regulated by the market itself (McGirr, 2001). Friedrich von Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*, which described communism, fascism and progressivism as all eventually leading to totalitarianism through control of the market and public policy, was considered the libertarian "bible" (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008).

Traditionalists believed that a free society could not exist without social and moral stability. In general they believed that stability was impossible without authority and authority was based on historical precedent and moral imperatives (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008). Authority derived from the nuclear family, the church and local government with the federal government intervening only when absolutely necessary. Those in the traditional camp differed from their libertarian counterparts in that they tended to be more religious. Traditionalists, while less concerned with individual liberty than the libertarians, were still uneasy with the government assuming responsibility for things they believed best served by family, church and community (McGirr, 2001). This proved to be another area that the libertarians differed significantly with their conservative kin (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008).

One area that would prove to be vexing to the traditionalists was the liberal/progressive embrace of secularism as an underlying component of their governing philosophy. Secularism, having no religious affiliation or roots, seemed to many conservatives a rudderless way to navigate. Secularism was also synonymous with collectivism and socialism to conservatives, so they viewed federal

secularism as inviting communism into the government. This created a deep distrust of the programs associated with the New Deal and subsequent similar programs, including those created by other "conservatives" (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008).

Conservative Anti-Communism

Although there were areas where the libertarian and the traditionalist differed they were bound together by their mutual hatred of communism abroad and mistrust of progressivism at home. Virulent anti-communism not only provided a common ground for the traditionalists and libertarians but also acted as a link between the post-war conservatives and the Eastern elite who dominated Republican politics in the pre-war years (Schoenwald, 2001). The Right was convinced that the ultimate goal of communism was to subjugate the world and that the U.S. had an obligation to thwart that goal. Liberals also viewed the communist threat as real, although they believed in a policy of containment of the threat as opposed to the conservative desire to "roll-back" the communists from their gains (Schoenwald, 2001).

Containment equaled capitulation to communism to many conservatives. One was either with the conservatives as standing against the threat of communism or one was a communist. For many, especially those on involved with fringe groups such as the John Birch society, there was no middle ground and the liberals (i.e., progressives) were against them.

Coinciding with this disagreement over how to face the global threat of communism was the conservative's deep fear of progressive federal policies. The secular nature of federally administered programs made conservatives uneasy. This fear was summed up well by the conservative intellectual Russell Kirk, who wrote in 1953 that "divine intent rules society... and that political problems, at bottom, are religious and moral problems." Therefore, Kirk argued that the separation of church and state was ultimately impossible (cited by Schoenwald, 2001, p. 21). Conservatives could not accept the notion that the federal government acting as a secular entity should be inserting itself into affairs they believed to be best dealt with locally. Secularism was associated with moral relativism and conservatives, particularly the traditionalists, believed this created an inherently immoral federal government (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008).

The hard core of the right wing would even turn on their own. When retired military general Dwight Eisenhower ran for the presidency as a Republican, conservatives hoped he would roll back the New Deal programs that they so fervently disliked. This did not happen; Eisenhower viewed his politics as modern Republicanism, in which the government's responsibility included relieving poverty and increasing funding for education and health (Cotter, 1983).

This adherence to ideological centrism angered many right-leaning conservatives who thought that keeping New Deal policies was a capitulation of the Republican Party to the progressives. The founder of the John Birch Society, one of the most virulently anti-communist groups in the U.S., even went so far as to accuse President Eisenhower of being a "conscious agent" of communism due to his moderate views and willingness to sustain many New Deal policies (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008). The Right-wing conservatives thus began searching for a way to wrest control of the Republican Party away from the moderates who would keep the New Deal intact.

Societal Critique

As communism was coming to be seen as less threatening abroad, conservatives turned their attention to the social upheaval that wracked the United States during the 1960s. The Right believed the upheaval was partially the result of the moral relativism that had been created by the progressive tendencies of the federal government. From the civil rights movement to the student movements, conservatives believed they were witnessing the breakdown of society. The self-regulating harmonious system that existed in society was being disturbed by bad ideas and the politics of progressivism (McGirr, 2001). The cause of this breakdown, according to conservative thought, was the relativism that had pervaded America since the inception of the New Deal as well as the rootlessness that came from America unmooring itself from traditional modes of society (Nash, 1996).

The libertarian conservatives viewed the federal role in the civil rights movement as a usurpation of states' rights that would create unfettered growth in the power of the federal government; such as when President Kennedy nationalized the Alabama National Guard to ensure the

segregation of the University of Alabama (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008). As the civil rights movement progressed and challenged the status quo, conservatives in the *traditionalist* vein, felt that their way of life was increasingly under attack. This belief that they were under siege from all quarters became even more acute as the university student protest emerged in the late 1960s.

In the mid-1960s, the New Left, particularly Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other student groups, began to challenge the middle-class values of their parents' generation. Although the reality was different, to many conservatives universities did little to rein in the activities of these groups, allowing them to protest, sometimes violently, with few consequences under the auspices of free speech. As a result, universities were seen as the bastions of progressive thought in the United States (McGirr, 2001).

Professors came to be viewed by many on the Right, including the intellectual Right, as inculcating the ideas of progressivism and moral relativity in their students (Nash, 1996). This acceptance of relativism, the doctrine that truth, knowledge and morality is not absolute, but must be understood in its historical and cultural contexts flew in the face of conservatives' cherished beliefs.

Conservative commentators believed this permissive, questioning atmosphere allowed and even encouraged the riots and sit-ins to occur (Meyer, 1969). National conservative voices doubted that the universities could control groups such as the Black Panthers or SDS and that the groups were disinterested in discussion and would force change through the "storming of one hundred Bastilles" if necessary (Zoll, 1969, p. 1261).

The ideological impulse of the country as a whole was beginning to drift rightward as social and cultural struggles increased. The conservative core had long assumed that many of these issues could be traced directly to the progressive policies of the federal government and public opinion seemed to be turning to their point of view. As tensions rose across the country, many in the white middle-class who had previously described themselves as New Deal Democrats began to rethink their political alignments (McGirr, 2001). This once solid Democratic core began to realign themselves with the conservatives in the political landscape. Conservative ideologies began to shape public opinion at large.

As more people left their old Democratic political affiliations to move to the Republican Party, the political power in the country began to shift rightward in the mid-

sixties (Chafe, 1995). The election of Nixon was a major landmark of this political shift. His law and order campaign appealed to the middle class white workers who believed they were viewing the disintegration of their society happen on television every night (Flamm & Stiegerwald, 2008). This shift became the mainstream with the election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency. It was at this point that the conservatives had opportunity to begin reshaping the government by limiting its size and scope. One area revisited was federal funding to higher education, since restructuring education appealed to everyone in the conservative fold due to ideological opposition to federal interference in education.

Higher Education: A Private Good?

Many of the problems the conservatives viewed as harming higher education should be seen from the context of how they view education more generally. William Jeynes (2007) argues the foundations of conservative educational philosophy are twofold. The first foundation is the concept of dualism, which states that humans have two sides, a virtuous moral side and a selfish side, with the purpose of education being to tame the selfish (Jeynes, 2007). The

second foundational idea was that one learned through reason alone (Jeynes, 2007).

The progressive view is that dualism is incorrect and humans learn from experience rather than reason (Jeynes, 2007). If people learn by experiencing the world, then there is nothing that cannot be investigated and everyone should have these experiences. To conservatives, this exemplifies the worst of progressivism's moral relativity and expansive inclusivity. Therefore, if the enterprise of education is, from a conservative perspective, one of moral development and this is best left to parents, local communities and the church, what role should the federal government have overseeing higher education?

The conservative movement's *libertarian* desire to be free from federal regulation led them to view federal money as being a form of control. With lower funding levels, universities would be forced to take measures that that would make them take on a business model for functioning (Field, 2006). *Traditionalists* do not like the secularism and relativity associated with higher education, which they see as exacerbated by the relativism of governmental decision-making process. The entire conservative spectrum desires lower taxes; one way this goal is achievable is through spending cuts for education.

Higher education, an institution that is disliked due both to the federal monies it absorbs and the relativism of the institutions themselves, makes a good target.

Conservative attempts to deflect more of the costs of education onto students attending college substantiates their understanding that higher education is a private good. As Jenyes argues, the conservative viewpoint is that the individual is the beneficiary of obtaining a higher education and should be shouldering a larger share of the financial burden. This conservative ideological belief is brought into focus by the changes in federal financing of higher education since conservatives began significantly influencing policymaking in the federal government.

Budget Data During the Conservative Ascendency:

1986, 1996, 2005

To explore how conservative ideologies have impacted higher education, budget data concerning higher education will be presented. The years 1986, 1996 and 2005 were chosen for several reasons. It can be argued that the political ascent of the conservative movement began to take hold in the United States in 1981 with the election of

Ronald Reagan. Reagan was president until 1989; 1986 was chosen as it was in the early part of his second term.

The conservative movement continued to grow in 1994 when the "Republican Revolution" was ushered in with the election of a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress. President Bill Clinton, while a moderate Democrat, had to work with Republicans to pass budgets, oftentimes having to compromise on federal spending to get budgets passed.

The year 2005 was chosen because it is during the presidency of George W. Bush, arguably the pinnacle of conservative ascendancy in modern U.S. politics. This year is in the middle of President George W. Bush's second term in office. The year 2005 President Bush's Republican Party had complete control over the reins of government, controlling the Senate, the House and the Executive branch. In 2006 the Republicans lost control of the both the House and Senate.

President Reagan, an ardent supporter of smaller government and *laissez faire* economics, opposed government regulation. His educational policy was libertarian in that he wanted the states to take the federal role out of the equation to increase local control and lower taxes (Arnone, et al., 2004). However, with a Democratically controlled

House, he was unable to disengage the federal government from helping students pay for college. Higher education, in fact, saw a rise in funding.

1986 Budget Data

In 1986 there were 5.3 million students in public four-year institutions (Digest of Educational Statistics [DES], 2006). The average cost of tuition, room board and fees for 1986 was \$3,805 (DES, 2007). Adjusted for inflation this is equivalent to \$6,998 [2006 dollars]. Available to these students in the 1986 budget was 13.7 billion dollars of aid (Office of Budget Management [OBM], 1988) an average of \$2,584 per student.

This aid was accessible via several vehicles including need-based grants and loans. The needs-based federal Pell grant program was funded to 3.5 billion dollars; 2.6 million financially eligible students obtained funding through this vehicle (OBM, 1988). Student Stafford loans were funded through two avenues: Guaranteed loans and direct student loans. The federal government subsidized 8.1 billion dollars worth of Guaranteed loans of which \$504 million was through the PLUS program, which permits parents to take out federal loans for a student attending an

eligible institution (OMB, 1988). The direct loan program funded \$829 million worth of loans. Over 3.2 million students used the Guaranteed loan program and 896,000 took advantage of the direct loan program (OMB, 1988). The average PLUS loan size was \$2,639 while the average Stafford loan was \$2,193 (OMB, 1988). See Table 2 for a breakdown of the data.

Table 2

Aid available in 1986 with classification of aid type and average loan amount, 1986

	1986
Aid available to students in higher education	13.7 billion
Allocation to Pell grants	3.5 billion
Number of students granted aid	2.6 million
Guaranteed Loans (Stafford) funded	8.1 billion
PLUS loan average	\$2,639
Stafford loan average	\$2,193
Direct loans	829 million

(data from Office of Budget Management, 1988)

It is important to note the differences between the two types of loans, Guaranteed and direct. The Guaranteed loans are originated by private financial entities directly to the student. Interest accrued on these loans is then subsidized by the federal government from origination to six months after a student has either graduated or has stopped attending school. Direct loans are partially originated from the federal government and are distributed

by the institutions themselves, based on need. For direct loans the government does not subsidize the interest (OMB, 1988).

1996 Budget Data

In 1994 the Republican Party won control of both houses of Congress leaving President Clinton facing a legislature that was hostile to his ideas and his ambitions for the country. This left Clinton in the position of having to negotiate every spending package that he wanted passed. Higher education funding decreased or remained steady from 1994 to 2000 once the Republicans came to power (OBM, 2008).

By 1996 there were over 5.8 million students enrolled in public four-year institutions in the United States (DES, 2006). The average undergraduate tuition was \$6,530 (DES, 2007). Adjusted for inflation the tuition was \$8,390.36 [2006 dollars]. The federal budget of 1996 allocated a total of \$38.2 billion dollars to student aid (OBM, 1998) an average of \$6,586 per student.

This aid was allocated in a variety of ways from need-based Pell Grants to student loans. As Table Three shows, of the \$38.2 billion total, \$5.6 billion was set aside for

the Pell Grant program with 3.6 million students meeting the eligibility requirements and the average award was \$1,567, or \$2,013.43 adjusted to 2006 dollars (OBM, 1998). There was \$25 billion available to students by way of the loan programs. Fourteen billion seven hundred million dollars were available through the subsidized Stafford loan program with \$9.7 billion going through the Guaranteed loan program, \$5 billion through direct loans and 2.2 billion through the PLUS program. Over 4.5 million students utilized these needs-based loans (OBM, 1998). These loan amounts averaged \$3,300, \$4,240.15 in 2006 dollars (OBM, 1998).

Table 3

Pell grant, subsidized Stafford and PLUS loan funding including average award/loan amounts for 1996

Pell Grants	5.6 billion
Average aid award	\$1,567
Stafford loans	14.8 billion
Guaranteed loans	9.7 billion
Average loan amount	\$3,411
Direct loans	5 billion
Average loan amount	\$3,242
PLUS loans	2.2 billion
Guaranteed loans	1.4 billion
Average loan amount	\$5,788
Direct loans	799 million
Average loan amount	\$5,623

(data from Office of Budget Management, 1998)

In 1993 a new loan vehicle for student aid was created, the unsubsidized Stafford Loan. These loans were not need-based like the subsidized Stafford; rather they are available to any student who believes they need the monetary help in affording the costs associated with college. By 1996 just under \$8 billion dollars had been taken out in the form of unsubsidized Stafford loans with an average loan of \$3,300, \$4,240.15 in 2006 dollars (OBM, 1998). These loans were made available through the Guaranteed and Direct Loan programs; the breakdown of how much went to which loan is available in Table Four. Interestingly, there were 2.2 million students who borrowed this money, a little more than half the number that borrowed through the subsidized loan program (OBM, 1998).

Table 4

Unsubsidized Stafford totals and loan amounts for 1996

Unsubsidized loan totals	8 billion
Guaranteed Stafford	5.4 billion
Average loan amount	\$3,598
Direct loan	2.5 billion
Average loan amount	\$3,262

(data from Office of Budget Management, 1998)

One reason why students began taking out larger loans and relying on the unsubsidized variety in greater numbers is the increased inflation in college costs. Between 1986 and 1996 college charges went up 20%, making it more

difficult for students and their parents to afford tuition (DES, 1997). These numbers continued to increase between 1996 and 2005.

2005 Budget Data

The governing philosophy of progressivism, which helped shape the United States of the mid-twentieth century, had been slowly undermined from at least the Reagan administration. Once President George W. Bush took office in 2000, the conservative ideology that began developing in the 1950s finally dominated government policy. Both houses of Congress and the executive branch were under conservative Republican control, thus allowing President Bush the ability to alter the functioning of the government in the way in which the conservatives believed it should.

The administration of George W. Bush has not radically cut the funding that helps students afford college. Rather, the administration has shifted the responsibility of college costs to the student by limiting the federally backed and funded programs that have been in place since 1965. As will be demonstrated, the amount of money going to unsubsidized loans has been increasing. The Bush

administration has also altered the amount of money going to the states themselves, which has a detrimental effect on public higher education.

Tax cuts have reduced the amount of federal money going to the states (Shapiro & Friedman, 2004). The reduced taxes have forced many states to cut budgets to deal with their own deficits (Lav & Brecher, 2004). These budget deficits are often managed by cuts in funding to higher education, a more politically viable target than areas such as infrastructure or Medicare benefits (Hebel, 2008). This puts universities in an untenable position financially. Many universities end up passing their cuts on to the students in the form of tuition increases which puts more students in a position where they need some form of aid to afford college. The federal government however, is making it more, not less difficult to obtain this aid.

In 2005 there were 6.8 million students enrolled in public four-year institutions (DES, 2007). The average undergraduate tuition, with room and board at these institutions was \$10,454 (DES, 2007). The 2005 federal budget allocated \$68.4 billion dollars to Pell Grants and Stafford Loans (OBM, 2007). Of this, \$12.5 billion was given to the Pell Grant program (OBM, 2007). Just over 5.1

million students received this aid with the average award being \$2,456 (OBM, 2007).

The federal government funded 24.5 billion dollars in subsidized Stafford loans, \$18.7 billion, coming from the Guaranteed loan program (OBM, 2007). Over 6.9 million students took these loans and the average loan was \$3,500 (OBM, 2008). Within the PLUS loan program there were 8.3 billion dollars borrowed: \$6 billion from the Guaranteed program and \$2.2 billion from the Direct loan program (BM, 2007). There were 23.2 billion dollars of unsubsidized loans taken out in 2005 (OBM, 2007). Five and half million students assumed these loans with an average loan of \$4,300 (OBM, 2007). Table Five below shows the total amounts that were allocated to the various areas of higher education aid in 2005. Table Six provides a more specific breakdown of how the monies were allocated to the various aid and loan programs including the number of students receiving aid and average loan sizes.

Table 5**Aid Funds Available for Higher Education, 2005 (in billions)**

Pell grants	12.5
Guaranteed student loans	
Stafford	18.7
Unsubsidized Stafford	18.4
PLUS	6
Direct student loans	
Stafford	5.8
Unsubsidized Stafford	4.8
PLUS	2.3

(data from Office of Budget Management, 2007)

Table 6**Number of students aided and average aid award/loan, 2005**

Pell grant	
Number awarded	5.1 million
Average award	\$2,456
Guaranteed student loans	
Stafford	
Number of loans	5.4 million
Average loan	\$3,463
Unsubsidized Stafford	
Number of loans	4.2 million
Average loan	\$4,322
PLUS	
Number of loans	630,000
Average loan	\$9,599
Direct loans	
Stafford	
Number of loans	1.6 million
Average loan	\$3,666
Unsubsidized Stafford	
Number of loans	1.1 million
Average loan	\$4,266
PLUS	
Number of loans	248,000
Average loan	\$9,145

(data from Office of Budget Management, 2006)

The number of students assuming unsubsidized loans was smaller than for the subsidized loans but the amounts were larger, indicating that more money was needed to make ends meet. Between the years of 1995-96 and 2005-06 the percentage of subsidized Stafford loans declined from 29 to 19 percent of the funds students utilized to finance higher education (College Board [CB], 2006). Furthermore, subsidized student loans decreased as a portion of total education loans from 57 percent in 1995-96 to 34 percent in 2005-06 (CB, 2006). As the proportion of subsidized loans decreases the more reliance is placed on unsubsidized and private loans. This can be attributed to the rapid rise in college tuition. When adjusted for inflation, tuition has increased by over 35 percent between 2001-06 (Tomsho, 2006).

The private loan sector is comprised of banks, credit unions and other lending institutions that lend directly to students or parents without the student loan rules of the federal system. The federal government does not subsidize these loans and their interest rates are not capped; they are variable rate loans and can reach 20 percent (Schemo, 2007). Many students acquire up to \$100,000 worth of private loan debt. Should they default they are usually unable to have the debts discharged via bankruptcy due to

the federal overhaul of the bankruptcy laws (Field, 2007). In 1995-96 private loans made up less than 5 percent of all education loans, but by 2005-06 private loans had increased to 20 percent (CB, 2006).

As the tuition rates go up and the availability of federal monies goes down, students in the middle and lower socioeconomic classes find themselves forced into an uncomfortable decision. These students must now decide whether they wish to forgo college completely to enter the workforce, attend more affordable local community colleges or take out loans, to complete a four-year degree. If they opt to attend a community college they are faced with the sobering statistic that only 23 percent of them will go on to receive a baccalaureate degree (Tomsho, 2006). Should they opt to take out loans they face being in debt, on average, for \$17,700 by the time they graduate (CB, 2006).

While coming to terms with the idea of having a significant debt after graduating from college, students also are realizing that their choices are actually limited. The dynamism of the job market requires workers to rely more heavily on intellectual skills that are acquired through higher education. As evidenced in Chapter Three above, the job growth in the knowledge based industries of health, education and the professional sectors have

expanded steadily, while the continuing contraction of jobs in the manufacturing arena has limited the options graduating high school students have for job stability without some higher education.

The costs associated with higher education are on the rise. Individual funding through grants and subsidized loans is increasingly limited with more students forced outside the federal system and into private loans to afford the cost of college. Education is becoming ever more important for those in the job market, making a college degree a necessary credential. Over time, increased pressure is placed on lawmakers, policymakers and higher education administrators to find ways to help students pay for college.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY

This chapter contains three sections. Section one discusses the implications of the findings for higher education and the broader society and a discussion of problems the researcher had with budgetary data. The second section provides suggestions to policymakers and higher education administrators. The final section provides ideas for further potential research.

Implications of the Findings

Higher education is fast becoming an essential part of the education of the people of the United States given the steady loss of manufacturing jobs due to elimination or outsourcing. Students coming out of high school today are facing more competition for jobs than previous generation. Those who do manage to obtain one of these jobs work under the constant strain that they may lose their jobs with little notice and little job training outside their manufacturing area. The professional areas of education,

healthcare, information technology and engineering are significant job growth areas but require at least a modicum of post-secondary education.

There is considerable evidence that students who obtain a degree have considerable advantages over those who do not. As previously discussed, these benefits are not only to the individual, but also to society in general. College graduates, on average, earn more than those who do not complete a degree; these higher earnings turn into higher tax revenues for the government (Baum & Ma, 2007). Attending college corresponds to lower unemployment and thus a smaller reliance on government safety net programs (Baum & Ma, 2007).

With all the benefits associated with obtaining a college degree, more and more students are viewing college as a way up the socioeconomic ladder. For students in the lowest 25th percentile economically, however, the cost of a college education may be prohibitive (Baum & Ma, 2007). Higher education costs are rising faster than the rate of general inflation (Burd, 2006). This makes affording college an ever-increasing burden on students which will, in many instances, prevent lower income students from enrolling and as Baum & Ma argue, low-income students are far less likely to ever complete a degree if they do not

initially enroll after high school (2007). This leads back to income potential; if income levels of those who complete a degree are higher they are more likely to send their own children to college. College is one of the tools available to society to help break the cycle of poverty in the U.S, as President Johnson argued when he ushered the Higher Education Act through congress.

Students who are not able to afford college on their own look to the federal government for help in achieving the goal of a higher education. While higher education costs continue to rise, however, there is stagnation in the level of aid awards for Pell grants. This stagnation leaves an increasing gap between what tuition is covered and what is not, forcing students to begin working or taking out loans to fill the gap.

Higher education funding is not limited to federal student aid money. Appropriations from state legislatures have also historically provided significant funding to higher education. The data from the early 1990s showed a negative gain in appropriations nationally (Franklin & Palmer, 2007). Over the last five years, these appropriations on the whole, have remained anemic, with only a few states able to increase their higher education appropriations significantly due to good economic growth

(Franklin & Palmer, 2007). Many states have had to pare back their funding due to economic hardships, stemming from the recession that began in 2001. Although many states recovered from this recession they have had a difficult time bringing their higher education appropriations back to their previous levels (Franklin & Palmer, 2007). Cuts in state funding, combined with stagnant federal student aid availability, leave many state colleges with budget deficits. To alleviate these deficits most colleges turn to tuition increases to offset the decreased funding.

With limited Pell grant availability, many students look to federal student loans but are finding that they have to rely on unsubsidized rather than subsidized loans since the percentage of subsidized loans has decreased each year. This creates a debt burden that, already large, begins to accrue interest as soon as the student accepts the loan, versus subsidized loans that defer interest accrual until a student leaves school.

Parents are also becoming more involved with helping students afford college. Many find themselves taking out large PLUS loans to help their children go to college. However, these loans pose potential serious consequences to the parents. Should the student be default on the loan the parents credit suffers along with that of the student.

The conservative belief in the individual responsibility for education is manifested in the growth in percentages of unsubsidized loans that students assume. The conservative ideology of privatization is realized more fully with the growth of the private loan industry. Separate from and unfunded by the federal government, these lenders seem to be a good option to many students as these lenders are able to offer more money per semester than does the federal loan system (Schemo, 2007). Private loan companies, however, are not bound to the low interest rates of federal loans and this has the potential to put graduates in a very difficult situation when it comes time to pay the loans back (Burd, 2006).

The financial burden is further placed on the individual with the promotion of 529 savings plans. People are able to place money into accounts to help pay for a child's college education later. These savings plans are often tax differed by the states in which the student attends college and typically work in one of two ways. Many 529 plans offer the opportunity to lock in tuition rates at the time of the accounts initial establishment, thus protecting against future tuition increases. Other 529 plans are savings plans that invest in the stock market; therefore the individual has more liability.

These factors, the job market requirements for higher education, high tuition cost, low aid levels and higher levels of student loan debt, affect the society and the individual in several ways. As students in lower socioeconomic levels come out of high school some may defer college or skip it all together. This leads to lower lifetime earning and fewer tax dollars being generated by this group. Also, as the Baum and Ma study indicated, the children of this group would be less likely to attain a college degree perpetuating the poverty cycle. The job market also suffers if students do not attend college. If the U.S. is not graduating enough people to fill these knowledge based positions companies will be forced to look outside the U.S. to fill the void.

For those who do finish college and enter the marketplace many will find themselves burdened with debts, which on average are around \$17,000 for public four-year institutions (Baum & Ma, 2007). While the college-educated worker makes more money over the course of their careers, this monetary increase is obviously not immediately realized upon graduation. Many of these students could find it difficult to establish a household while paying off student loans. This difficulty in starting out in a career could be particularly acute if the student has private

loans carrying higher interest rates with larger monthly payments.

Interpreting Budget Data

Two problems arose in the interpretation of the data for this thesis. The first issue was one of context. The budgetary data sets taken from each year are fairly easily comparable to adjoining years. This thesis, however, utilized years that were separated by a decade or more in time. This made performing a side-by-side comparison between the years increasingly difficult as the federal presentation of the budgetary data rose in sophistication from year to year and even made the data within each year difficult to interpret. An example, a cursory examination of the 2005 funding shows that a total of \$149 billion dollars was allocated to aid (OBM, 2007). Deeper investigation, however, shows that this aid figure included not only Pell Grants and the Stafford Loan program but also areas not investigated by this research including Perkins and consolidation loans as well as federal work-study.

The increasing sophistication of the budget data lead to the problem of not being able to penetrate fully the monetary figures to make exact comparisons. In reviewing

the budgetary figures the author was able to make cursory, and relevant comparisons that offered to support the thesis, however, the author also realized that a full and in depth accounting as to the ramifications of all the numbers was beyond his ability.

Suggestions for Policymakers

The issue of college affordability is one that needs to be addressed from multiple avenues. Policymakers should find ways to increase awareness in the community at large of the importance of higher education for the individual and the society. To do this could help shift societal attitudes regarding federal spending away from the conservative trend over the past 15-20 years. As more people are made aware of the funding problems associated with higher education it is hoped that they would begin applying pressure on their lawmakers to provide more funding. Without a large segment of society willing to pay for increased higher education aid funding the chances decrease that lawmakers will act.

Policymakers also need to work more closely with state lawmakers to persuade the states to increase their funding levels. States are dealing with economic problems and as

discussed above, state budgets are often balanced by cuts in higher education funding. These cuts are made evident in the appendix, when adjusted for inflation the money going to public higher education was lower in 2005 than in 1990.

Policymakers should focus on the many long-term tangible and intangible benefits, increased lifetime earnings and civic engagement, that go along with increasing state funding for higher education. If policymakers are able to get state legislatures to see further into the future than simply the next year's budget, they would be able to make a strong case for increasing, not decreasing state funding for higher education even when the economy is in distress.

States should be pressured to intercede on behalf of students if the federal government will not. One way policymakers can achieve this goal is to clarify the societal and individual benefits of higher education. Policymakers should also focus on the benefits that states reap from having a more vibrant higher education system in their states. More money going to the higher education system, in the form of aid or block grants, will help alleviate the debt burden students are facing. This would help more students finish college, which would increase the number of college degrees in the state. Increased

educational levels attract employers creating a larger tax base and contributing to an improved state economy.

Policymakers need to explain this monetary cycle more clearly to help state lawmakers see the long-term benefits of a short-term sacrifice.

Policymakers also need to investigate the rapid increase in higher education costs. Are there areas where cost cutting measures can be taken to decrease the speed in which higher education costs are rising? Are public institutions taking on appropriate missions for their niche by diverting funds to an area that is not necessarily to the university's benefit? If not, then policymakers should work to establish more appropriate missions for the institutions they work for, this has the potential of saving public colleges large amounts of money that could be utilized to either offset tuition increases with larger institutional grants or by decreasing or preventing tuition hikes in the first place.

Suggestions for Further Research

There are several avenues of potential research pertaining to this topic that this author did not address. Private, non-profit colleges were not considered but would provide insight as to how colleges that base budgets on tuition are being affected by the decrease in available grant and subsidized loan monies. In what ways are these colleges adjusting to the changing face of higher education funding? There has been news coverage in the past few years regarding some of the larger elite private universities utilizing endowment funds to offset costs to lower and middle income student groups (Finder & Rimer, 2007). Since not every private institution has the funds available for such an undertaking, how are smaller private schools drawing low and middle-income students if aid funding is not enough to cover the costs of tuition?

An investigation of private, for-profit colleges would add a richer context to this topic as well. Has the growth of for-profit institutions adversely affected the loan process? Is the growth of the private student loan sector associated with the growth of the for-profit system?

State financing, while mentioned only briefly here, is a large provider of funds for the public higher education

system. As such, how has state funding shifted since the passing of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and more specifically how has state funding changed in the last 15-20 years? Has the pattern of funding from states followed that of the federal spending pattern? What is the effect of a downward turn in federal and state tax receipts on the higher education spending?

References

- Anonymous. (1963). New deal programs: CCC and NYA. *Congressional Quarterly*. 42, 12, 292. Retrieved February 7, 2008 from EBSCOAcademic.
- Anonymous. (n.d.). *Brief history of the department of Labor*, Retrieved on January 8, 2008 from <http://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/dolchp03.htm>
- Arnone, M., Hoover, E., Selingo, J., Suggs, W. (2004, June). Ronald Reagan remembered. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on March 31, 2008 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i41/41a02401.htm>
- Baum, S., Ma, J. (2007). Education pays: the benefits of higher education for individuals and society. Retrieved on February 22, 2008 from College Board http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/about/news_info/trends/ed_pays_2007.pdf
- Black, M. (2004). The transformation of the southern democratic party. *The Journal of Politics*, 66, 1001-1017.
- Brecher, A., Lav, I. (2004). *Passing down the deficit: federal policies contribute to the severity of the state fiscal crisis*. Retrieved January 25, 2008 from Center on Budget and Policy Priorities <http://www.cbpp.org/5-12-04sfp.pdf>.
- Brown, J. (1988). A is for atom, b is for bomb: civil defense in American public education, 1948- 1963. *Journal of American History*, 75, 1, 78-90. Retrieved on February 7, 2008 from JStor database.
- Buckley, W. (1955, November) The liberal line. *National Review*, 1,1.

Burd, S. (2006, September). As the volume of private loans soar students feel the pinch. *The Chronicle of Higher education*. A20-A23. Retrieved on March 12, 2008 from Lexus-Nexus Academic.

Census Bureau. (2008). Age distribution of college students 14 Years old and over, by sex: October 1947-2005. Retrieved February 13, 2008, from www.census.gov/population/sodemo/school/tableA-6.xls.

Chafe, W. (1995). *The unfinished journey: America since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cloward, R., & Piven, F. (2005). The politics of the great society. In S. Milkis & J. Mileur (Eds.), *The great society and the high tide of liberalism* (pp. 253-269) Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

College Board. (2007), *2007 Trends in higher education series: student loans*. Retrieved on November 12, 2007 from College Board http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/about/news_info/trends/student_loans.pdf

College Board. (2007), *2007 Trends in student aid 2006*. Retrieved on March 16, 2008 from College Board http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/press/cost06/trends_aid_06.pdf

Coleman, V. (1989). Labor power and social equality: union politics in a changing economy. *Political Science Quarterly*, 103, 687-705. Retrieved February 11, 2008, from JStor database.

Cotter, C. (1983). Eisenhower as party leader. *Political Science Quarterly*, 98, 255-283. Retrieved January 21, 2008 from JStor database.

Cowie, J. (1999). *Capital moves: RCA's seventy year quest for cheap labor*. New York: The New Press.

David, M., & Morgan, J. (1963). Economics and education. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 77, 423-437.

- Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Data retrieved on July 18, 2007 from Bureau's website, non-static address, 2008.
- Drucker, P. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Dunlon, J., Galenson, W. (1978). *Labor in the twentieth century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Field, K. (2007, September). Congress may provide relief to struggling debtors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(5), A18- A19. Retrieved January 22, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Field, K. (2007, May). Prominent member of higher education commission will form research center on college costs. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from <http://chronicle.com/daily/2006/05/2006052405n.htm>
- Finder, A., Rimer, S. (2007, December 11). Harvard to aid students high in middle-class. *New York Times*. Retrieved April 14, 2008 from Lexis Nexis Academic.
- Franklin, D., Palmer, J. (2007). Grapevine compilation of state higher education tax appropriations. *Center for the Study of Educational Policy*. Retrieved April 28, 2008 from <http://grapevine.ilstu.edu/historical/appropriations%202006=07.pdf>.
- Friedman, J., Shapiro, I. (2004). Tax returns: a comprehensive assessment of the Bush administration's record on cutting taxes. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved January 25, 2008, from <http://www.cbpp.org/4-14-04tax-sum.htm>
- Galbraith, J. (1984). *The affluent society 4th edition*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Graham, H. (1984). *An uncertain triumph: federal education policy under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Hebel, S. (2008, January). Colleges brace for cuts as state economies take a turn for the worse. *The Chronicle*

of Higher Education. Retrieved January 25, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v54/i20/20a01701.htm>

- Hess, F., McGuinn, P. (2005). Freedom from ignorance? In S. Milkis & J. Mileur (Eds.), *The great society and the high tide of liberalism* (pp. 289-319) Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hofstadter, R. (1963) *Anti-intellectualism in American life*. New York, New York: Knopf.
- Hofstadter, R. (1965). *The paranoid style in American politics, and other essays*. New York: Knopf.
- Huber, E., Rueschemeyer, D., & Stephens, J. (1993). The impact of economic development in democracy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 7,3, 71-85. Retrieved from JStor database.
- Jackson, K. (1985). *Crabgrass frontiers: The suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jeynes, W. (2007). *American educational history*. Thousand Oaks, CA: California State University, Long Beach.
- Kahlenberg, R. (2006, March). Cost remains a key obstacle to college access. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 52 (5), p. B51-B52. Retrieved October 2, 2007 from EBSCOhost Academic search premiere.
- Key, S. (1996). Economics or education: the establishment of the American land grant universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 196-220.
- Kizer, G. (1970). Federal aid to education: 1945-1965. *History of Education Quarterly*, 10, 1, 84-72. Retrieved on February 12, 2008 from JStor database.
- Lucas, C. (1994). *American higher education: a history*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McGirr, L. (2001). *Suburban warriors: The origin of the new American right*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Meyer, F. (1969). *The revolution eats its parents.*
National Review, 15, 541.

Monroe, A. (2001). *How the federal housing administration affects homeownership.* Retrieved February 8, 2008 from http://www.ichs.harvard.edu/publications/homeownership/monroe_w02-4.pdf

Nash, G. (1996). *The conservative intellectual movement in America since 1945.* Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2004). Average undergraduate tuition and fees and room and board rates charged for full-time students in degree-granting institutions, by type and control of institution: 1964-65 to 2003-04: Table 312. Digest of educational statistics, 2004. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved September 5, 2007, from http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/tables/dt04_313.asp.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2007). Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by control and type of institution: 1963 through 2005: Table 180. Digest of educational statistics, 2007. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved April 6, 2008, From http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_180.asp?referrer=list

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2006). Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by control and type of institution: 1963 through 2005: Table 176. Digest of education statistics, 2006. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/tables/dt06_176.asp

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2007). Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by control and type of institution: 1963 through 2005: Table 180. Digest of education statistics, 2007. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved April 6, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_320.asp?referrer=list

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2007) Average undergraduate tuition and fees and room and board rates charged for full-time students in degree-granting institutions, by type and control of institution: 1964-65 through 2006-07: Table 320. Digest of education statistics, 2007. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved April 6, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_320.asp?referrer=list

O'Connor, J. (2006). Civic engagement in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*. 38, 5, 52-58. Retrieved on March 14, 2008 from <http://heldref-publications.metapress.com/media/n97bk9fwnckqnehdr02/contributions/x/6/8/8/x688c9816666280k.pdf>

Office of Budget Management. (2008). *The budget of the United States of America, Appendix*. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Office of Budget Management. (2007). *The budget of the United States of America, Appendix*. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Office of Budget Management. (1998). *The budget of the United States of America, Appendix*. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Office of Budget Management. (1988). *The budget of the United States of America, Appendix*. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Office of Budget Management. (1968). *The budget of the United States of America*. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Porter, K. (2002). The value of a college degree. *ERIC digests*. Washington D.C. Retrieved on January 10, 2008 from EbscoAcademic.

Rudy, W. (2003). *Building America's schools and colleges*. Cranbury, N.J.: Cornwall Books.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

- Schemo, D. (2007, June 10). With few limits and high rates, private loans deepen a crisis in student debt. *New York Times*. Retrieved January 22, 2008 from Lexis-Nexus Academic.
- Schmidt, P. (2004, September). Report Card Calls for Change in Academe. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on November 16, 2007 from EBSCOhost Academic.
- Schoenwald, J. (2001). *A time for choosing: The rise of modern American conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, C. (2002). The master conspiracy of the John Birch society: From communism to the new world order. *Western Journal of Communication*, 66, 224-247.
- Tomsho, R. (2006, October 25). As tuition soars, federal aid to college students fall. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved January 22, 2008, from Lexis-Nexus Academic.
- Trilling, L. (1950). *The liberal imagination: essays on literature and society*. New York: Viking Press.
- Unger, I. (1996). *The best of intentions: the triumphs and failures of the Great Society under Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon*. New York: Doubleday Press.
- United States Office of Education. (1965). The higher education act: Some questions and answers. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Zoll, D. (1969). Shall we let America die? *National Review*, 15, 1261.

Bibliography

- Cuciti, P., Marshall, K. (1986). *The great society and its legacy: Twenty years of U.S. social policy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hedges, C. (2006). *American fascists: The Christian right and the war on America*. New York: Free Press.
- Hunter, J. (1991). *Culture wars: The struggle to define*

America. New York: Basic Books.

Leuchtenburg, W. (1963). *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the new deal*. New York: Harper and Row.

Oliver, K. (1999). Post-industrial society and the psychology of the American far right, 1950-74. *Journal of Contemporary History*. 34, 4, 601-618.

Spring, J. (2005). *Political agendas for education: From the religious right to the green party*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Young, C. (1984). The struggle and dream of black studies. *The Journal of Negro Education*. 53, 368-378. Retrieved on October 3, 2007 from JStor Database.

APPENDIX

Appropriations from state for public degree-granting institutions, by state or jurisdiction: Selected years, 1990-91 through 2004-2005

State or jurisdiction	State appropriations (in thousands of dollars)					
	1990-91	1995-96	2000-01	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alabama	708,191	879,680	991,302	1,086,580	1,095,040	1,132,482
Alaska	168,395	171,580	190,650	211,152	217,745	232,868
Arizona	591,656	691,335	903,196	891,255	888,236	953,653
Arkansas	315,372	437,257	583,794	585,788	585,078	601,070
California	5,313,052	4,811,297	7,891,669	7,919,246	7,405,508	7,583,950
Colorado	423,710	497,663	655,037	567,380	494,764	494,773
Connecticut	363,427	462,183	664,356	715,304	718,291	770,317
Delaware	115,729	107,968	193,695	190,335	193,911	208,568
District of Columbia	0	0	3,019	4,154	4,139	5,237
Florida	1,638,218	1,898,618	2,656,376	2,755,551	2,800,829	2,993,973
Georgia	915,303	1,254,216	1,826,961	1,785,986	1,751,732	1,795,886
Hawaii	304,131	280,503	395,884	462,453	459,620	374,297
Idaho	177,918	223,108	290,746	302,898	317,794	327,898
Illinois	1,296,895	1,161,833	1,760,300	1,703,137	1,822,869	1,601,567
Indiana	886,124	977,517	1,257,919	1,267,690	1,294,406	1,332,693
Iowa	544,945	649,901	813,805	780,047	750,111	752,859
Kansas	437,413	528,243	664,201	662,822	662,320	687,572
Kentucky	617,915	690,328	939,047	943,876	984,564	925,266
Louisiana	566,798	603,825	834,643	1,037,543	1,081,957	1,087,287
Maine	174,737	158,044	212,144	218,528	216,910	227,017
Maryland	724,223	717,377	999,723	1,024,608	993,743	1,011,728
Massachusetts	471,368	669,102	1,038,998	917,956	820,888	932,895
Michigan	1,326,884	1,572,241	1,991,098	1,931,256	1,731,675	1,807,688
Minnesota	744,381	901,114	1,174,797	1,212,946	1,120,554	1,083,760
Mississippi	365,574	570,035	758,242	731,047	757,385	770,130
Missouri	563,430	669,832	945,746	854,915	850,139	870,916
Montana	110,199	121,730	137,341	145,727	148,593	140,638
Nebraska	318,482	382,465	514,235	512,976	486,098	496,169
Nevada	161,581	223,413	333,117	397,539	453,144	471,522
New Hampshire	71,226	79,376	96,157	104,728	106,405	110,435
New Jersey	854,989	1,045,117	1,246,554	1,374,123	1,410,600	1,547,573
New Mexico	307,083	413,344	538,822	577,647	606,600	637,859
New York	2,313,128	2,202,186	4,461,671	2,995,208	2,894,535	2,956,576
North Carolina	1,351,111	1,686,718	2,221,600	2,208,058	2,334,186	2,562,993
North Dakota	129,986	138,785	188,047	194,719	173,578	187,962

Ohio	1,360,141	1,488,806	1,922,571	1,812,533	1,821,109	1,846,028
Oklahoma	473,898	536,307	754,540	724,840	707,140	725,408
Oregon	377,476	442,603	640,347	545,413	628,220	534,487
Pennsylvania	962,121	1,110,896	1,331,544	1,330,460	1,282,991	1,345,487
Rhode Island	113,614	121,153	157,137	165,060	166,289	168,731
South Carolina	578,794	647,111	853,139	737,934	656,585	673,181
South Dakota	81,859	105,090	129,680	140,096	142,532	147,505
Tennessee	663,536	850,110	969,316	1,007,059	1,002,907	1,059,503
Texas	2,627,916	3,302,958	4,236,852	4,220,459	4,248,841	4,351,691
Utah	304,738	414,407	531,975	578,426	600,043	624,935
Vermont	40,997	42,400	53,605	58,482	59,606	61,620
Virginia	886,208	839,587	1,395,308	1,285,924	1,189,861	1,316,343
Washington	828,700	914,200	1,200,392	1,208,061	1,162,885	1,209,222
West Virginia	263,269	320,198	382,269	389,532	361,838	349,317
Wisconsin	841,192	937,513	1,186,415	1,093,719	1,027,362	1,023,024
Wyoming	120,623	130,162	149,009	187,486	196,077	210,359

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1990-91 through 2003-04 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, "Finance Survey" (IPEDS-F:FY91-96), and Spring 2001 through Spring 2006.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Anthony Ward Robinson

ADDRESS: 3109 Lowell Ave.
Louisville, KY 40205

DOB: November 20, 1972

EDUCATION: M.A., Higher Education Administration
University of Louisville
2008

B.A., Psychology
University of Louisville
1999

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES: National Academic Advising
Association

PUBLICATIONS:

Church, M., Robinson, A. (2006). Ethics in academic
Advising. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*.
8, 2. Available from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/>

Berg, K., Church, M, Robinson, A. (2006). Advising students
for medical school: What is the best approach?
The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal. 8, 3.
Available from: <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/>